



CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Army Environmental Vision Statement

*The Army will be a national leader in environmental and natural resource stewardship for present and future generations as an integral part of our mission.*³

The Army's commitment to natural resources management is reflected in the U.S. Army environmental strategy for the 21st century. The Army environmental strategy is depicted as a building established on a solid foundation with four pillars supporting the environmental stewardship vision and the Army mission. The four pillars symbolize the Army environmental program and represent the four major areas of activity: compliance, restoration, pollution prevention, and conservation. The conservation pillar focuses on responsibly

managing Army lands to ensure long-term natural resource productivity so the Army can achieve its mission.

The Army's commitment to natural resources management is emphasized in Army Regulation (AR) 200-3 (*Natural Resources-Land, Forest, and Wildlife Management*), which requires that Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans (INRMPs) be developed and maintained for all Army installations. This INRMP is a tool to help natural resources

³ Army Environmental Policy Institute. 1992. U.S. Army Environmental Strategy into the 21st Century. U.S. Government Printing Office 1993-747-677, 38 p.

es personnel implement ecosystem management at Fort Wainwright. The INRMP looks at how Fort Wainwright's natural resources program objectives fit within the framework of the military mission and integrates with the environmental program as a whole, outdoor recreation, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), cultural resources, surrounding communities, and neighboring lands. It is also a source of information for responsible or interested parties that are not directly managing Fort Wainwright's natural resources. The INRMP is a component of and fits within the framework of the Range Development Plan.

1.1 Goals, Objectives, and Policies

1.1.1 Goals

The main goal of this INRMP is to support U.S. Army Alaska (USARAK) military and nonmilitary activities while maintaining a functional, healthy ecosystem. However, over the next five years this document and the programs outlined here will be refined as the situation warrants. Ecosystem management is an evolving management scheme. As new information and ideas are gleaned from current research, Fort Wainwright's management will change to reflect the best information available. However, the main goal of this INRMP is to support USARAK military and nonmilitary activities while maintaining a functional, healthy ecosystem.

The following general goals are USARAK's commitment to manage natural resources at Fort Wainwright. All five goals not only support management of natural resources but also support the overall military mission.

Military Readiness

- Provide quality natural resources, as they are critical training assets for accomplishing the military mission of USARAK at Fort Wainwright.

Stewardship

- Manage natural resources at Fort Wainwright to ensure good stewardship of public lands that are entrusted to the Army's care.

Quality of Life

- Improve the quality of life for the Fort Wainwright community and the general public through development of high quality natural resources-based recreational opportunities.

Compliance

- Comply with laws and regulations that pertain to management of Fort Wainwright's natural resources.

Integration

- Integrate elements of natural resources management into a single program that in turn is integrated into Fort Wainwright's environmental and military training programs.

1.1.2 Objectives

Statements listed below represent general USARAK objectives for attaining goals presented in Section 1.1.1 above. These statements will serve as a checklist for monitoring the plan's success. More specific objectives and tasks are proposed in Chapters 3-7.

Military Readiness

- Ensure no net loss in the capability of Fort Wainwright's lands to support existing and projected military missions.
- Maintain quality training lands through damage minimization, mitigation, and restoration.

Stewardship

- Use ecosystem management philosophies to protect, conserve, and restore native fauna and flora with an emphasis on biodiversity enhancement.
- Monitor and manage soils, water, vegetation, and wildlife on Fort Wainwright with a consideration for all biological communities and human values associated with these resources.
- Provide economic and other human-valued products of renewable natural resources when such products can be produced in a sustainable fashion without significant negative impacts on the military training mission.

- Provide professional enforcement of natural resource laws.
- Involve the surrounding community in Fort Wainwright's natural resources program.
- Ensure the Fort Wainwright natural resources program is coordinated with other agencies and conservation organizations with similar interests.

Quality of Life

- Provide opportunities for consumptive uses of natural resources within the biological and recreational carrying capacities.
- Provide natural resources-based opportunities for other outdoor recreation such as hiking, snowmobiling, boating, and birding.
- Provide conservation education opportunities to the military and civilian community.
- Establish and maintain an environmental setting conducive to a healthy and satisfying lifestyle for the military community.

Compliance

- Manage natural resources within the spirit and letter of environmental laws, particularly the Sikes Act, upon which this INRMP is predicated.
- Manage to protect, restore, maintain or enhance sensitive species, wetlands, and unique areas.
- Use the NEPA process to make informed decisions that include natural resources considerations, mitigation, and agency and public involvement.
- Ensure that Fort Wainwright's natural resources program is consistent with the protection of cultural and historic resources.
- Implement this INRMP within the framework of Army policies and regulations.

Integration

- Ensure the integration of, and consistency among, the various activities identified within this INRMP.

- Ensure that natural resources management is consistent with principles of integrated pest management at Fort Wainwright.
- Ensure the integration of new military infrastructure development with the principles and guidelines of this plan.
- Coordinate the implementation of natural resources management with the overall Fort Wainwright environmental program.
- Use the natural resources program to support and enhance other elements within the Fort Wainwright environmental program.
- Provide the command with information needed to make decisions, which include natural resources-related values.

1.1.3 Fort Wainwright's Land and Natural Resources Management Policy

Over the last 10 years, USARAK has been inundated with numerous requests and proposals from state, federal, and municipal government agencies, businesses, utilities, clubs, organizations, and individuals for authorization or permission to use Army lands for nonmilitary purposes. Requests have included commercial or long-term real estate interests involving rights-of-way, easements, land use permits, leases, outgrants, land transfers, exclusive use areas, and special concessions, many of which have detrimental effects on current or future military training on Fort Wainwright. It is anticipated these requests will probably increase in the future as the populations of Fairbanks and its satellite communities continue to grow.

It is the position of USARAK to favor temporary, noncommercial low-impact uses of Fort Wainwright by the local community as long as Fort Wainwright's natural resources or its ability to fulfill its mission will not be adversely impacted. In general, it is current USARAK policy to deny requests for nonmilitary uses of Fort Wainwright properties if those requests include or involve a requirement for long-term real estate commitments such as leases, easements, or land transfers, or if they create a potential adverse impact on the

military mission or the environment. The only exception to this would be when such actions clearly result in tangible benefits to the military training mission or to the environment. These situations will be carefully scrutinized and evaluated by appropriate staff members. No longer is “good public relations” alone a justifiable reason to sacrifice limited and crucial training lands.

A full policy statement is included in Section 3.4.5.3 and includes examples of past requests for and acceptable nonmilitary land uses. This INRMP establishes decisions and actions that affect or have a potential to impact Fort Wainwright land, water, and other natural resources.

1.2 The Plan

The Sikes Act Improvement Amendments (SAIA) of 1997, Public Law (PL) 105-85, Section 670a (a)(3), states that

“Consistent with the use of military installations to ensure the preparedness of the Armed Forces, the Secretaries of the military departments shall carry out the program required by this subsection to provide for the conservation and rehabilitation of natural resources on military installations; the sustainable multipurpose use of the resources, which shall include hunting, fishing, trapping, and non-consumptive uses; and subject to safety requirements and military security, public access to military installations to facilitate the use.”

To facilitate the program, the law requires that an INRMP be prepared and implemented for each military installation, including withdrawn public lands. Each plan must be consistent with the use of military lands to ensure military preparedness and cannot result in any net loss in the capability of the installation to support the military mission. In accordance with Section 670a(b) of the act, to the extent appropriate and applicable, an INRMP should provide for the following:

- Fish and wildlife management, land management, forest management, and fish and wildlife-oriented recreation.
- Fish and wildlife habitat enhancements or modifications.

- Wetlands protection, enhancement, and restoration where necessary for support of fish, wildlife, or plants.
- Integration of, and consistency among, the various activities conducted under the plan.
- Establishment of specific natural resources management goals and objectives and time frames for proposed action.
- Sustainable use by the public of natural resources to the extent that the use is not inconsistent with the needs of fish and wildlife resources.
- Enforcement of applicable natural resources laws (including regulations).
- No net loss in the capability of military installation lands to support the military mission of the installation.
- Review of this INRMP and its effects every five years.
- Provisions for spending hunting and fishing permit fees exclusively for the protection, conservation, and management of fish and wildlife, including habitat improvement, and related activities in accordance with INRMP.
- Exemption from procurement of services under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 and any of its successor circulars.
- Priority for contracts involving implementation of this INRMP to state and federal agencies having responsibility for conservation of fish and wildlife.
- Public access to the military installation that is necessary or appropriate for sustainable use of natural resources by the public to the extent that such use is consistent with the military mission and the needs of fish and wildlife resources, subject to requirements necessary to ensure safety and military security.

An INRMP guides the natural resources management programs at each installation. Implementation of the INRMP management measures maintains, protects, and enhances the ecological integrity of the training lands and the biological communities inhabiting them. USARAK prepares this INRMP

in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G). This interagency participation results in a document that reflects the mutual agreement of Department of Defense (DOD), Department of the Interior (DOI), and the state of Alaska concerning conservation, protection, and management of natural resources. USARAK also provides an opportunity for the public to review and submit comments on this INRMP.

1.2.1 Purpose of the Plan

The primary purpose of this INRMP is to establish natural resources goals, objectives, and policies that USARAK and BLM will use to manage military and nonmilitary use of lands in Alaska. It is the intent of DOD to clearly and openly express these goals, objectives and policies to the public through this INRMP.

The secondary purpose of this INRMP is to guide USARAK and BLM natural resources managers and personnel in their decision-making regarding management of military land in Alaska and the implementation of proposed natural resource projects.

Implementing this INRMP would provide a land management program that conserves land as an essential asset for training, provides excellent stewardship, complies with environmental laws, and provides recreational opportunities that contributes to the quality of life.

A further purpose of this INRMP is to serve as a funding identification document for the management of natural resources on military lands. All of the projects listed in this INRMP are also used to meet the requirements of the Environmental Program Report (EPR). Projects are identified as high, medium, and low priority within the INRMP, to relate to the Class 1, 2, and 3 funding priority definitions in the EPR. USARAK must fund all high (class 1) projects in this INRMP, and will implement all medium (class 2) and low (class 3) projects if funding is available.

1.2.2 Scope of the Plan

The focus of this INRMP will be on the management of natural resources on the military installation. The management measures have been developed based on the current conditions of the resources, and the military mission and activities as they are anticipated. This INRMP will guide natural resources management of Fort Wainwright for the next five years (2002-2006) and provide a solid foundation from which to build and continue the program beyond the year 2006.

USARAK recognizes that the release of contaminants into the environment and response actions to clean up those contaminants may result in adverse impacts to natural resources. However, the Restoration Branch within the Environmental Resources Department is responsible for identifying such releases, considering risks and assessing impacts to the environment (including impacts to endangered species, migratory birds and biotic communities), and developing and selecting response actions when unacceptable risk to ecological receptors from the release is likely. As a result, contaminant release, cleanup actions and potential ecological impacts are discussed in the Fort Wainwright Installation Restoration Plan and are not included within the scope of the plan.

1.2.3 Structure of the Plan

Chapter 1: Introduction describes the overall natural resources goals and objectives, gives a brief review of past natural resources management actions, defines joint management and stewardship of USARAK lands, and states the military mission. Military, federal, state, and local responsibilities and partnerships are also explained. The integration of NEPA compliance within this INRMP is discussed including defining alternatives.

Chapter 2: Affected Environment describes the relevant existing environmental resources of Fort Wainwright lands.

Chapter 3: Ecosystem Management describes the ecosystem management program goals, objectives, planning, inventory and monitoring. Various components of the program area explained, and proposed management alternatives are listed.

Chapter 4: Physical Resources Management Alternatives describes land, watershed and minerals management programs. Goals, objectives, planning, inventory, monitoring and responsibilities are discussed, and proposed management alternatives are listed.

Chapter 5: Biological Resources Management describes wetlands, forest, fire, fish and wildlife, endangered species, special interest areas, and pest management programs. Goals, objectives, planning, inventory, monitoring and responsibilities are discussed, and proposed management alternatives are listed.

Chapter 6: Social Resources Management describes education, awareness and public outreach; outdoor recreation; conservation enforcement; and cultural resources management programs. Goals, objectives, planning, inventory, monitoring and responsibilities are discussed, and proposed management alternatives are listed.

Chapter 7: Support Resources Management describes the NEPA program, decision support systems, and other programs affecting natural resources management. Goals, objectives, planning, inventory, monitoring and responsibilities are discussed, and proposed management alternatives are listed.

Chapter 8: Natural Resources Implementation outlines procedures to implement the INRMP and its associated actions. This includes funding mechanisms, priorities, staffing requirements, planning methods, and command support.

Chapter 9: Environmental Consequences determines the impacts of each alternative on the relevant environmental resources. The consequences are presented in matrix form and cumulative impacts are considered for each resource.

Sections at the end of the document include lists of preparers and contributors of this document, sources referenced in this document, and agencies and individuals who were contacted during preparation of this document for consultation of their expertise, and eight appendices.

This INRMP is an umbrella document for the detailed action plans. It describes projects to be

implemented while the action plans contain details to prepare a scope of work for each project. Each action plan will have a separate NEPA document, an Environmental Assessment (EA), prepared and can be found under separate cover. The action plans, summarized in Appendix D, are as follows:

- Forest Management Action Plan
- Habitat Management Action Plan
- Wetlands Management Action Plan
- Soil Resources Action Plan
- Fire Management Action Plan
- Outdoor Recreation Management Action Plan
- Aviation Management Plan
- Special Interest Areas Management Plan
- Ecosystem Management Action Plan

The Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) and Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) for Fort Wainwright are written as separate plans.

1.2.4 Resource Management Plan

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 requires the BLM to develop, maintain, and, when appropriate, revise land use plans. Public Law 106-65, which withdraws portions of Fort Wainwright lands for 25 years from the public domain, requires that BLM prepare a Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the military withdrawal. The objective of BLM's land use planning is to ensure that public lands are managed under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield by:

- Providing a process for evaluating resources information, which includes consideration of social and economic factors, to decide appropriate public land uses.
- Ensuring participation by the public, state and local governments, Indian tribes, and appropriate federal agencies.
- Using collaborative and multi-jurisdictional approaches to ensure consistent decision-making across different land ownerships and jurisdictions.

- Providing a documented record of land allocations and permissible resource uses and constraints that are available to the public.
- Providing a framework to guide subsequent implementation decisions.

BLM has developed a comprehensive land use planning base consisting of decisions reached in its RMPs. BLM land management is an ongoing process of decision-making, implementation, monitoring and assessment, and adjustment that allows for continuous corrections and reduces the need for major plan revisions. New information or proposals might necessitate a plan revision or an update to a plan's associated NEPA analysis. BLM's nine-step planning process, in 43 CFR Part 1600, integrates the NEPA decision-making process. New RMPs and RMP revisions require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The Fort Wainwright 2002-2006 INRMP does not conflict with the current BLM RMP for Fort Wainwright. Until the updated BLM RMP is in place, this plan acts as the RMP.

1.2.5 Section 106, National Historic Preservation Act

In the past, natural resources management projects were overlooked as potential causes of adverse impacts to archeological sites. Activities such as tree removal and training land restoration are all potentially damaging. In order to reduce negative impacts to cultural resources, projects that involve ground-disturbing activities will be processed through the USARAK Cultural Resources Manager (CRM). Furthermore, the CRM will be consulted in areas of long-range planning (such as the INRMP) that define policy.

Determination of effect and consultation guidelines provided in implementing regulations for the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (36 CFR 800) will be followed during review of projects. Any project assessed as having an effect on a cultural resources site or historic property at Fort Wainwright will be coordinated with the Alaska State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Section



Fort Wainwright's Ladd Airfield played an important role in the World War II lend-lease program.

106 of the NHPA has been considered in the preparation of this plan, and it has been determined that there are no significant issues associated with the implementation of this plan.

Natural resources-related law enforcement actions also have the potential to beneficially impact preservation of cultural resources. If natural resources enforcement officers are added to the USARAK Conservation staff, they will also be trained in enforcement of various cultural resources laws, especially the Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA).

Natural and cultural resources are not mutually exclusive. Personnel involved in both of these programs at Fort Wainwright will work closely with one another to ensure their successful integration.

1.3 Background

1.3.1 Location and Neighbors

From the very beginning, the people of Alaska have welcomed and supported the military in their state.⁴

Fort Wainwright is located in central Alaska, north of the Alaska Range in the Tanana River Valley. The post lies 120 miles south of the Arctic Circle near the cities of Fairbanks and North Pole in interior Alaska in the Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB). The installation consists of the Main Post,

⁴ Lt. Gen. L.E. Boese, Commander, Alaskan Commander in Forces for Freedom, Anchorage Daily News, May 14, 1995.

Tanana Flats Training Area (TFTA), Yukon Training Area (YTA) and Dyke Range. Fort Wainwright is the fourth largest Army training area in the United States.

A majority of the land surrounding Fort Wainwright is state of Alaska-owned land. Principal land use management categories include fish and wildlife habitat, public recreation, forestry, agricultural sale, and settlement. The Chena River State Recreation Area lies adjacent to YTA's northern boundary and is managed for public recreation. Eielson Air Force Base (AFB) adjoins the western boundary of the YTA. The Tanana Valley State Forest lies north of Fort Wainwright with private and FNSB-owned land parcels to the south. Parcels of native-owned land also border Fort Wainwright.

1.3.2 Acreage, Acquisition, and Land Status

1.3.2.1 Acreage

The Main Post is two miles east of central Fairbanks on the Chena and Tanana rivers. It contains the cantonment area, a small arms range complex, and a close-in range complex. The Main Post occupies approximately 13,000 acres. TFTA is across the Tanana River from the Main Post and contains over 650,000 acres. TFTA occupies most of the land between the Wood and Tanana rivers, stretching 32 miles south of the Main Post (Johnston 1988). YTA is 16 miles east-southeast of Fairbanks, adjacent to Eielson Air Force Base. The YTA is roughly rectangular, stretching 28 miles east-to-west and 17.5 miles north-to-south. YTA encompasses much of the land between the Chena and Salcha rivers, northeast of the Richardson Highway (BLM and U.S. Army 1994), almost 260,000 acres. Figure 1-1 shows the general location of Fort Wainwright.

1.3.2.2 Land Acquisition for Military Use

Fort Wainwright comprises 928,016.97 acres. Beginning in 1937, the area that is now the Main Post was withdrawn indefinitely by Presidential Executive Orders (EO) in the following years as listed in parentheses 7596 (1937), 8325 (1940), and 9526 (1940), and Public Land Orders (PLO) 139 (1943), 690 (1950), 748 (1950), 738 (1951), 818 (1952), 854 (1952), 1760 (1958), and 3013 (1963). An

additional 13,622.67 acres were transferred to the Army in 1961 from the Air Force. EO 3825 and PLO 135 took lands from this area. The Main Post now contains 13,756.31 acres of withdrawn lands (Center for Ecological Management of Military Lands 1998).

Dyke Army Range is located along the Tanana River, between the Main Post and Eielson AFB. This land was withdrawn indefinitely by PLOs 1521 and 1541 in 1957. Dyke Army Range has 2,285 acres (Center for Ecological Management of Military Lands 1998).

TFTA (654,700 acres) was temporarily withdrawn from public land in 1941 through EOs 8847 and 9526. Three hundred and twenty acres were returned to public use through PLO 796 in 1952. In 1962, PLO 2676 removed the expiration of use from EOs 8847 and 9526. In 1963, PLO 3011 indefinitely withdrew 20 acres on Harding Lake for Army use (Center for Ecological Management of Military Lands 1998).

From 1956 through 1961, the Army obtained a permit from the Secretary of Interior for use of YTA. Congress withdrew YTA in 1961 for a 10-year term through PL 87-326. (After the Engle Act of 1958, all withdrawals of more than 5,000 acres for defense purposes require congressional approval). In 1971, PLO 5240 extended the withdrawal through 1976. The YTA withdrawal was renewed again in 1986 (PL 99-606) for a 15-year term. Land for two NIKE missile test sites on YTA was withdrawn indefinitely through PLO 1345 (1956), 1523 (1957), and 1917 (1959). PLO 2768 (1962), 684 (1950), 3922 (1966), and 4161 (1967) adjusted acreage on YTA. Acreage on YTA now totals 257,275.66 (Center for Ecological Management of Military Lands 1998). Fort Wainwright acquisitions are shown in Figures 1-2a and 1-2b.

1.3.2.2.1 PL 106-65 Land Withdrawal

The public lands and interests in lands withdrawn and reserved by PL106-65 includes the Fort Greely East and West Training Areas and the Fort Wainwright YTA. This area is comprised of approximately 869,862 acres of land in the Fairbanks North Star Borough and the Unorganized Borough, Alaska, in accordance with Section 3012.

Figure 1-1. General Location of Fort Wainwright.

See FWA INRMP Maps\FWA INRMP FIG01-01.PDF.

Figure 1-2a. Fort Wainwright Land Acquisition.

See FWA INRMP Maps\FWA INRMP FIG01-02a.PDF.

Figure 1-2b. Legend.

See FWA INRMP Maps\FWA INRMP FIG01-02b.PDF.

1.3.2.2.2 Existing Rights-of-Way

The Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS) transports crude oil from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, Alaska. The TAPS right-of-way extends through the Fort Wainwright Yukon Training Area and was authorized by the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act of 1973. Its width is 50 feet plus the ground area occupied by the pipeline, which is approximately four feet.

An additional right-of-way for the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System lies adjacent to the TAPS right-of-way. The width for the natural gas pipeline is 50 feet.

A right-of-way has been approved by the Army and the BLM for the proposed Trans-Alaska Gas System, which runs roughly parallel with the TAPS and Natural Gas Transportation System.

On May 13, 1996, Golden Valley Electric Association (GVEA) filed an application with the BLM for a right-of-way grant pursuant to Title V of FLPMA of 1976 (43 USC 1761), for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a 230 kilovolt power transmission line between Healy and Fairbanks, Alaska. The proposed project crosses lands reserved for military use. BLM has management jurisdiction on withdrawn military lands on actions not associated with military use. A right-of-way to GVEA was granted by the BLM with concurrence from the military to cross TFTA. This right-of-way is 150 feet wide and crosses TFTA from the southwest boundary at Wood River to the northern boundary at Goose Island. This right-of-way lies approximately one kilometer from the southernmost oxbows of the Tanana River.

Per the Fort Wainwright Yukon Maneuver Area Resource Management Plan (BLM and U.S. Army 1994), withdrawn lands are not available for disposal, including state or native selection, sales under FLPMA or the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, or exchanges. No rights-of-way are allowed in those portions of withdrawn lands that are closed to public access. However, there is a process identified to determine the validity of rights-of-way claims for administrative purposes only.

1.3.3 Installation History

“I believe in the future, who holds Alaska will hold the world, and I think it is the most strategic place in the world”⁵

Fort Wainwright was originally referred to as the Alaskan Air Base or Alaskan Air Corps Station. It was designated as Ladd Field in December 1939. The original installation served three purposes: the Cold Weather Test Station; an air sub-depot for repair and testing of airplanes; and the central Alaskan station of the Alaskan Wing, Air Transport Command, for transportation of air freight and ferrying Lend-Lease planes to Russia (Anonymous 1991).

By 1947, the Army Air Corps had separated from the Army to become the Air Force, and what was then known as Ladd Field was transferred to the Air Force. In 1961, the Army reassumed command of Ladd Field and renamed the installation Fort Wainwright, after General Jonathan M. Wainwright (Anonymous 1995a). On July 1, 1963, Fort Wainwright became the home of the 171st Infantry Brigade, with the 172nd Infantry Brigade established at Fort Richardson. USARAK operated two independent brigades until post-Vietnam era drawdowns resulted in disbandment of the 171st Brigade in fiscal year 1973. At that time, the 172nd was headquartered at Fort Richardson with units detached at Fort Wainwright. Further reorganization resulted in USARAK being disbanded on December 31, 1974, with Alaska installations falling under Forces Command (Higginbotham/ Briggs & Associates 1991).

In 1986, the newly reactivated 6th Infantry Division (Light) replaced the 172nd Infantry Brigade. The 6th Infantry Division, deactivated in Korea following distinguished service in two world wars, was recalled as a specialized arctic/mountain light contingency force under U.S. Army Pacific (USARPAC).

Headquarters was established at Fort Richardson and remained there until 1990 when it was transferred to Fort Wainwright (Higginbotham/Briggs & Associates 1991; Public Affairs Office undated).

⁵ General Billy Mitchell, 1935

Following deactivation of Headquarters, 1st Brigade, 6th Infantry Division (Light) in 1994, Headquarters USARAK became an active component at Fort Richardson. The major unit at Fort Wainwright became the 1st Brigade, 6th Infantry Division (Light). The Arctic Support Brigade, headquartered at Fort Richardson, also had units at Fort Wainwright (Anonymous 1995a). In 1998, the 6th Infantry Division (Light) was deactivated, and the 172nd Infantry Brigade (Separate) was activated.

1.3.4 Historic Natural Resources Program Development

Since 1961, when Fort Wainwright was returned to Army control, natural resources management has become increasingly important. Early efforts involved continuing programs initiated by the Air Force. These were conducted by Conservation Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) without a trained staff. By 1970, when the first natural resources professional was hired, the installation had developed two natural resources plans (U.S. Army 1970). At least four succeeding plans have since been developed.

1.3.4.1 Forest Management

USARAK has not completed a forest management plan for Fort Wainwright. A draft forest management plan (Fort Wainwright 1993) is the basis for forest management practices specified in this INRMP. Forest management on Fort Wainwright has emphasized wildlife habitat improvement rather than commercial timber objectives. The only commercial forestry on Fort Wainwright are the Christmas tree and firewood programs, which were started in 1994. They were offered free prior to that time.

This plan has twice been revised, the latest for 1993-1998 (Von Rueden 1983, 1993). These plans have information that is useful for portions of Fort Wainwright. The 1993-98 plan outlined the following long-range goals:

- Establish a 70-year rotation for hardwoods.
- Establish a 130-year rotation age for softwoods with a provision to delay harvest until 200 years in specific cases.

- Provide Christmas trees for base personnel.
- Harvest forest products from future construction and other development sites.

1.3.4.2 Fish and Wildlife Management

Early fish and wildlife management on Fort Wainwright included a variety of programs (U.S. Army 1970). The ADF&G was involved from the beginning, conducting a moose tagging project on what was then known as the Fort Wainwright Bombing Range. An early proposal also called for tagging furbearers on YTA to determine their movements and populations.

In the early 1970s, one project developed shorelines of small ponds and lakes to encourage waterfowl nesting, feeding, and resting. Project areas were closed to hunting with the objective of increasing viewing opportunities for area bird watchers, Scout groups, and school children. A bird checklist for Fort Wainwright was also started at that time.

Pre-1970 fisheries management included the following eight projects:

- Determine the feasibility of stocking rainbow trout in the power plant cooling pond.
- Improve the fishery at McNair Woods Gravel Pit; ADF&G stocked 25,000 grayling in 1970 with the removal of northern pike from the pond and construction of brush piles to protect grayling
- Measure chemical and physical characteristics of lakes and ponds to determine stocking suitability.
- Survey fisheries and compile a list of waters available, species of fish, methods of fishing, and access to them.
- Cooperative projects with ADF&G, which involved stocking of ponds and lakes on post, loans of Army equipment, assistance in rehabilitating lakes off-post, and construction of roads and trails to lakes.
- Collect/create educational materials for the Natural Resources Center, including mounted fish specimens, picture and slide libraries, and model lakes and streams.

- Create an oxbow lake in the Chena River channel.
- Investigate the feasibility of cold water fertilization to increase fish productivity.

In 1978, natural resources specialists from the three Alaska Command installations collaborated to draft a Natural Resources Conservation Program (Quirk, Gossweiler, and Kiker 1978). The first natural resources management plan specifically for Fort Wainwright was completed in 1981 (U.S. Army 1981). At that time, the Fort Wainwright program did not have an installation-specific cooperative plan and was still operating under a cooperative agreement between the 172nd Infantry Brigade, USFWS, and ADF&G.

In the 1980s, the major natural resources challenge for the installation was management of moose. In the early 1960s, the moose population of Game Management Unit (GMU) 20A was estimated at 20,000. It was thought that this high population was due to predator control management methods during the 1950s. A decline in that population began in the late 1960s, leading to an estimated 3,000 moose in 1975 (Gaseway et al. 1983). In 1998, the moose population in GMU 20A was estimated at 11,000.

Fort Wainwright initiated more stringent wildlife harvest reporting requirements during 1975-76 due to increased furbearer trapping pressure on Fort Wainwright. Furbearer harvest reports are still collected annually from trappers on the installation lands.

As a result of studies conducted during the 1970s, it was concluded that very few of the lakes on the installation had the capability to overwinter fish. While the Chena River offered some fishing opportunities, it was considered inferior to the fishing upstream due to increased water turbidity by the time it reached Fort Wainwright.

In 1988, Fort Wainwright and ADF&G began a cooperative study of black bear demographics (Hechtel 1991). Between 1988 and 1991, 45 individual bears were captured and studied. Overall harvest was judged to be sustainable, although areas on YTA may have localized over-harvest. No serious

black bear conservation problems were identified related to Fort Wainwright land management practices.

By the late 1980s, the impact of off-road recreational vehicles, especially airboats, on floating-mat wetlands of TFTA emerged as the most significant problem for natural resources management on Fort Wainwright. A series of intensive evaluations (Racine et al. 1990; Racine and Walters 1991 and 1994) followed and are ongoing.

The initial fish and wildlife management plan for Eielson AFB was written in 1975. The plan was revised in 1976, 1981, 1984, 1989, and 1994. These plans contain useful information for management of Fort Wainwright fish and wildlife resources.

1.3.4.3 Land Management

Main Post Area Landscaping:

The Fort Wainwright Main Post area was established in 1939 on a floodplain adjacent to the Chena River. Initial clearing for Ladd Field Main Post area, as it was then called, created vast areas of barren land that have never been substantially replanted. Most surface soil was lost during construction, but gravel fill and lawns have been established in nearly all areas where tree and shrub planting is appropriate.

Most mature native trees were removed during construction. Early landscape plantings were done in 1956-58 in the main headquarters, housing, and barracks areas. A large number of shrubs were planted in the headquarters area and on the Gaffney Road entrance in 1963. Planting efforts occurred during the 1970s through the late 1980s with varying degrees of success. Crabapple and cherry trees were planted in housing areas in 1989 and a large number of white spruce were planted along Gaffney Road. Most died due to their origin (south-central Alaska) and improper planting techniques. Any remaining were removed by 1992.

Agricultural Programs:

Fort Wainwright has no agricultural leases. Poor soils, high water tables, steep slopes, a short growing season, and incompatibility with the military mission preclude the use of any Fort Wainwright land for standard types of agriculture.

Other Land Management:

Since 1981, land management plans have been included as part of Fort Wainwright's natural resources management plans (U.S. Army 1981).

In 1996, USARAK initiated the Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM) program on Fort Wainwright. The ITAM program is centrally coordinated for USARAK, using assistance by representatives of both Natural Resources and Range Control at Fort Wainwright. The Land Condition Trend Analysis (LCTA) program was implemented in 1996. Geographic Information System (GIS) database development began the same year. Section 4.1 describes the general ITAM program and individual ITAM components.

1.3.4.4 1994 Fort Wainwright Proposed Resources Management Plan / Final Environmental Impact Statement

The *Fort Wainwright Yukon Maneuver Area Proposed Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement* was written to fulfill the mandate of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986. The document was the result of work by a joint BLM-USARAK planning team that consulted with the public throughout the process. The plan proposes a variety of nonmilitary uses while recognizing the primary military purpose of the withdrawn lands. The 1998-2002 INRMP used the 1994 *Fort Wainwright Proposed Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement* as a base on which proposed management activities are built upon.

1.3.4.5 Fort Wainwright 1998-2002 Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan

This 2002-2006 plan updates the 1998-2002 Fort Wainwright INRMP. Many of the proposed projects in the 1998-2002 plan were funded and implemented on Fort Wainwright. However, not all projects were completed. This INRMP continues many of these projects for the enhancement of natural resources on Fort Wainwright including:

- Staff salaries, equipment, and supplies
- Cultural resources studies
- LCTA program

- Forest management plan and commercial feasibility study
- Range improvement activities
- Supply Creamer's Field with bird feed
- Conduct moose census
- Develop Cross Cultural Communication Steering Committee
- Develop hunting, trapping, and fishing computerized check-in system
- Conduct hazard fuels reduction project at Badger Gate and Hamilton Acres in conjunction with BLM Alaska Fire Service (AFS)
- Purchase portable fuel tank for refueling Office of Aircraft Services (OAS) aircraft
- Rehabilitate Trench Line Objective and Russian Trench
- Resurface Manchu Lake Road
- Harden access to Horseshoe Lake
- Increase accessibility and fishing opportunities at River Road Pond

1.3.4.6 Organizational Status

In 1972, Fort Richardson's Commander delegated responsibility for environmental and natural resources management to a new Environmental Office within the Directorate of Engineering and Housing (now Directorate of Public Works) (Quirk et al. 1978). A Sanitary Engineer (GS-12) was hired to head the office with a staff including an Environmental Specialist (GS-09) and a Clerk/Typist (GS-04). As the office was also responsible for Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely, Natural Resources Specialists (GS-11) were hired on each of the three posts (Quirk et al. 1978). In the 1980s, the



172nd Separate Infantry Brigade will transform to a Stryker Brigade Combat Team.

Environmental Resources Office expanded to become a division within DPW, and USARAK Natural Resources was granted Branch status. Current and projected staffing of the Conservation Branch is discussed in Chapter 8.

1.4 Military Mission

The United States Army must maintain the capability, through a total force effort, to put overwhelming land combat power on any future battlefield and defeat any potential enemies. A decisive victory depends on the ability to deploy rapidly, fight, self-sustain, and win quickly with minimum casualties.

The United States has adopted an international political and military strategy that requires the nation's military forces to be ready to deploy on short notice for engagement anywhere in the world. The American people rightly expect these forces to be highly trained and equipped with the highest performance materiel and technology available. Ready, capable forces result from constant training and new or modified weaponry, and other equipment must be field-tested before being placed with the using units.

Because of the speed and maneuverability of modern armaments, today's and tomorrow's armed forces require large tracts of land for training and weapons testing. Changes in tactical doctrine and weapons technology, designed to dissuade any would-be aggressor, win battles, and minimize casualties to American and allied forces in the event of armed conflict, are increasing the need for such land despite reductions in the size of the United States military since the Cold War and the closure of some military installations.

In the 21st century, the Army faces unprecedented challenges to its ability to train. Increased environmental regulation of training lands and ranges coupled with increased economic development around Army installations contribute to a more challenging training climate. A sound land management program that provides economical and acceptable planning and execution is mandatory to protect that land as an essential training asset.

Implementing this INRMP would continue to provide a sound land management program that conserves land as an essential training asset, to provide excellent stewardship, to comply with environmental laws, and to provide recreational opportunities that contribute to quality of life.

1.4.1 Overview

1.4.1.1 USARAK Mission

The Spirit of the "Arctic Light"

*"We train to the highest standards in the toughest environment in the world – we are ready to go anywhere in the world within 18 hours – there is nothing that we cannot handle when we get there – we are up to it."*⁶

The primary military mission of Fort Wainwright and USARAK after the Cold War has been peacetime deployment to support U.S. interests worldwide, the defense of Alaska, and coordination of Army National Guard and Reserve activities in the state. Most USARAK combat forces, the 172nd Infantry Brigade (Separate), are at Fort Wainwright with Fort Richardson as the primary support base.

The U.S. Air Force (USAF) is a major user of Fort Wainwright for routine training and Major Flying Exercises (MFE). The USAF uses Fort Wainwright's Stuart Creek Impact Area as its primary tactical air-to-ground weapons range, and for low and high altitude bombing by B1 and B52 aircraft. The Yukon Measurement and Debriefing System, a computerized system that can create "air wars" of up to 36 aircraft simultaneously, has been installed on YTA. USAF pilots are debriefed to show how they reacted to enemy aircraft and various other simulated conditions. The Stuart Creek Impact Area is equipped with USAF targets, manned radar emitters, anti-aircraft threat simulators, and electronic scoring sensors.

Typically one MFE is conducted between February and April, four exercises between May and August, and one exercise between October and November. This results in USAF total use of YTA for about two or three hours each morning and afternoon during the two-week exercises. COPE Thunder, a USAF MFE formerly conducted at Clark AFB in

⁶Lt. Gen. L.E. Boese

the Philippines, is now conducted at Fort Wainwright and other areas.

The Blair Lakes Bombing Range on TFTA is primarily used by the USAF for gunnery and aircraft familiarization. This air-to-ground conventional training range provides realistic flying training opportunities for inert munitions.

1.4.1.2 USARAK Population and Major Troop Units

Subordinate commands to the brigade include the 1st Battalion, 17th Infantry; 172nd Support Battalion; 4th Battalion, 11th Field Artillery; 562nd Engineer Company; 507th Signal Company; 572nd Military Intelligence Company; 2nd Battalion, 1st Infantry; and E Troop, 1st Cavalry. The Arctic Support Brigade also has units at Fort Wainwright including C Company, Special Troops Battalion; 4th Battalion, 123rd Theater Aviation; 203rd Personnel Service Battalion; 267th Finance Support Battalion; 98th Direct Support Maintenance Company; and Law Enforcement Command. U.S. Marines have been using Fort Wainwright in recent years for annual training.

Fiscal Year 2001 demographics indicate that 4,024 active duty soldiers were stationed on Fort Wainwright. About 5,200 active Army family members and 650 Army retiree family members are part of the Fort Wainwright community, as are 870 civilian employees.

1.4.1.3 Anticipated Changes in Military Mission

While many aspects of the military mission are discussed in the INMRP, only the impacts of the natural resources management alternatives are considered. The impacts of the continued withdrawal for military use of Fort Wainwright were analyzed in the Alaska Army Lands Withdrawal Renewal Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement.

Future Army force restructuring may bring about changes to the military mission in Alaska. Impacts of ongoing and future training activities would be considered in separate environmental documents.

Changes in facilities that would affect natural resources will be determined by changes in the military mission. If Fort Wainwright were tasked with alternate missions, additional ranges may be needed. Such new missions have not been identified. Facility development that would likely affect natural resources include new ranges, impact and target areas, and buildings in areas that are now undisturbed. All would require completion of appropriate NEPA documentation.

1.4.2 Relationships Between Natural Resources and the Military Mission

At present, Fort Wainwright is capable of supporting its military mission. It should be noted, however, that its ability to continue functioning as such is linked directly to its current land and natural resources base. A crucial loss of lands and natural resources for a myriad of nonmilitary uses has placed Fort Wainwright at the threshold of adequacy for supporting its mission. Any future losses threaten its viability and should be contested strongly.

In many respects, USARAK's mission is highly dependent on natural resources, but at the same time it is moderately taxing on some of those resources. The Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance (LRAM) program mitigates some damage caused by this mission, and other ITAM programs within this INRMP will prevent or reduce future damage.

Recent reductions in troop strengths and in the amount of tactical training needed to support these troops have resulted in notable land improvements. Pending no further land or resource losses, it is anticipated that Fort Wainwright, by instituting these progressive land rehabilitation methodologies, will continue to provide a sufficient arena for current and future mission requirements.

1.4.2.1 Effects of the Military Mission on Natural Resources

The conservation of natural resources and the military mission will not be mutually exclusive.⁷

Fort Wainwright's missions have included a variety of uses on its lands. Over the years, light infantry,

⁷ AR 200-3, Natural Resources-Land, Forest, and Wildlife Management, para 2-11.

mechanized infantry, artillery, special forces, and assault aircraft have used Fort Wainwright for training.

As a part of the master plan, the land has been separated into three general land uses types: urban areas, training areas, and impact areas. Military use differs within these areas. This in turn affects public access and determines the natural resources management activities that can occur in each general land use type.

Fort Wainwright is fully capable of supporting its military mission. The military mission is natural resources dependent, and it affects some of these resources. The LRAM program mitigates some damage caused by this mission, and other ITAM programs within this INRMP will reduce future damage.

There is no evidence to suggest that the military mission is jeopardized on Fort Wainwright due to the capability of the land to support that mission. In fact, the land could support additional training as has been proven in the past when training levels were higher.

1.4.2.1.1 Past Mission Impacts on Natural Resources

The withdrawal of land (through BLM) for Fort Wainwright had a long-term positive effect on natural resources, as the area likely would have otherwise been enveloped by the expansion of Fairbanks and North Pole. Most of the land outside of the Main Post was left undeveloped, affected only by training impacts. In 1970, Fort Wainwright adopted a policy of actively conserving natural resources. A biologist was hired to initiate a land management program, which has grown steadily and has resulted in positive impacts on natural resources.

Impacts to natural resources on Fort Wainwright have been consistent with trends at other DOD holdings. The Unit Leader's Handbook for Environmental Stewardship (Department of Army 1994) lists six primary consequences of intensive and continuous use of Army training lands:

- The loss of historical sites, vegetation, water resources, and wildlife.

- Diminished quality of available realistic training areas.
- Diminished operational security.
- Ineffective tactical operations.
- The creation of safety hazards to personnel and equipment.
- An increase in training, maintenance costs, and litigation.

On Fort Wainwright, the first and last items have been the most consequential.

The most adverse mission impact is the development of supporting infrastructure throughout Fort Wainwright. Permanent loss or alteration of wetlands, wildlife habitat, vegetation, timber, water resources and cultural resources has occurred. This involved removing soil and native vegetation and replacing them with gravel. Most land outside the Main Post area was left undeveloped, affected only by localized training impacts. TFTA is relatively unaffected by military developments with exception of clearings for airstrips and targetry. YTA is more affected by development, including roads on tops of ridges, a combat landing strip, old bunker and missile sites, and targetry clearings. In 1996, USARAK began efforts to counteract the cumulative effects of military training impacts by establishing an Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM) program.

Noise from military training potentially affects natural resources by disturbing wildlife behavior. Noise sources include munitions firing and impact, low flying aircraft, and troop maneuver (both mechanized and pedestrian). Munitions produce the greatest noise levels, ranging from 112 to 190 dB(C). C-weighted (artillery fire, sonic booms, and explosions) and small arms sound levels have not been calculated for Fort Wainwright. However, there is little evidence that disturbance to wildlife is significant over time. No adverse cumulative effects of noise on wildlife have been observed on Fort Wainwright (Bonito 1980).

1.4.2.1.2 Present Mission Impacts on Natural Resources

There are also positive effects of the military mission on natural resources. The most important

is USARAK's commitment to natural resources management, including minimizing and mitigating military mission damage. This commitment is beneficial for both natural resources in general and people who use them.

The presence of Fort Wainwright preserves native ecosystems by preventing development and municipal expansion, and by ensuring that competing land uses are conducted in a manner that protects the environment. Natural resources management considerations and safety demands associated with the training mission limit other potentially more damaging land uses. Damage from training activities are repaired under the LRAM component of the ITAM program.

The success of Fort Wainwright's conservation efforts is evidenced by its diverse, self-sustaining natural resources. The installation is an important calving ground for moose, a nesting area for trumpeter swans, and habitat for hundreds of other native plants and animals.

The USARAK military mission fosters relatively healthy, stable ecosystems. The most basic and important reason for this is found in the very nature of the infantry's use of the land. While infantry-related exercises may cause localized damage, they very seldom threaten ecosystems or biodiversity. This is especially so in Alaska where impacts are, for the most part, small and of short duration. The only exception is when damage occurs in alpine tundra and permafrost areas, which take long periods of time to recover. USARAK takes every precaution to avoid causing damage in these areas.

Fort Wainwright continues to preserve native ecosystems by preventing urban development and municipal expansion. Natural resources management considerations and safety demands associated with the training mission limit the extent of other potentially damaging land uses. The diverse, self-sustaining natural resources found on Fort Wainwright attest to the success of its conservation efforts.

1.4.2.2 Effects of Natural Resources Management on the Military Mission

Military training is affected by limitations imposed by natural resources on Fort Wainwright. Most limitations involve wetlands protected by EOs,

federal laws, and Army policies. The elimination of all white phosphorous munitions use was imposed on Fort Wainwright in 1991. White phosphorus is commonly used to mark targets for air strikes, and without its use the Army and Air Force must rely on lasers.

Other limitations on training are imposed by terrain characteristics. Steep slopes and dense woodland, like that found in YTA, and wetlands, which compose nearly all of TFTA, are difficult barriers to vehicle maneuvering but provide excellent cover for dismounted infantry.

1.4.3 Future Military Mission Impacts on Natural Resources

It is difficult to quantify effects of future military activities on natural resources at Fort Wainwright due to the uncertainty involved with military training. If the mission remains unchanged, impacts on natural resources will remain similar to those today.

If large force-on-force military maneuvers were re-instituted on TFTA, impacts to resources would be similar to those in the past. Restricting such training to times when the soils of TFTA are frozen would minimize maneuver damage.

Future impacts to natural resources as a result of a mission change that are not covered under current planning documents will be addressed by separate NEPA documentation.

1.5 Joint Management and Stewardship

Joint management refers to Congressionally-directed shared responsibility by the BLM and the DOD for organizing, controlling, and supervising activities on certain withdrawn federal lands. Joint use may or may not also involve joint management. Both joint use and joint management require joint stewardship.

Joint stewardship refers to the working relationship entered into between USARAK and BLM for the care of withdrawn federal lands in Alaska and associated resources used by USARAK for military mission requirements.

The United States has adopted an international political and military strategy that requires the nation's military forces to be ready to deploy on short notice for engagement anywhere in the world. The American people rightly expect these forces to be highly trained and equipped with the highest-performance materiel and technology available. Ready, capable forces result from repetitive training. New or modified weaponry and other equipment must be field-tested before being placed with the using units.

Because of the speed and maneuverability of modern armaments, today's and tomorrow's armed forces require large tracts of land for training and weapons testing. Changes in tactical doctrine and weapons technology, designed to dissuade any would-be-aggressor, win battles and minimize casualties to American and allied forces in the event of armed conflict, are increasing the need for such land despite reductions in the size of the U.S. military since the Cold War and the closure of some military installations.

The majority of the land currently used by USARAK is on long-term withdrawal from public domain lands originally assigned to the BLM. Provisions for management of these lands are generally specified in each of the PLs, PLOs, EOs, and other enabling documents.

Whenever the military uses withdrawn public land, it incurs legal and moral responsibilities for the stewardship of the land and its resources. Residual responsibility for USARAK withdrawn lands remains with BLM, which retains interest in the stewardship of the transferred parcel, even though the land is under DOD's long-term management.

The reason USARAK land is withdrawn from other public use to the military is to enhance military readiness in the interest of national defense. If the land was intended to be managed primarily for multiple uses, it would not be managed by a military service. Under USARAK management, land is used primarily for national security purposes (e.g., training and testing) but will also be managed to accommodate additional uses as long as they do not impinge on the primary military readiness mission.

Multiple use of the lands it manages is an integral part of the mission of the BLM. As defined by FLPMA, multiple use implies that each authorized use of the land has an equal level of priority. DOD, on the other hand, is a single mission agency. As such, it has a single, mission-oriented use for the land it manages: military readiness for national defense. The quality of life of DOD's personnel is also an important component of DOD's national defense mission. In support of their specific missions, DOD's services and agencies implement a variety of land management practices on their installations that support military readiness and quality of life programs. For DOD, therefore, multiple use is an approach to land management rather than an element of its mission. A variety of land management tools such as hunting, fishing, nature trail maintenance, watchable wildlife programs, and the maintenance of groomed open spaces may be used in the INRMP in support of both quality of life programs and military training and testing requirements. By using a mix of these land management tools, DOD undertakes a multiple use approach to land management while still meeting the single mission use of the land (military readiness for national defense). An important aspect of this type of multiple-use approach to land management, however, is that it is employed only to the extent that it does not conflict with the military training and testing components of the overall national defense/readiness mission of the agency. For instance, USARAK manages lands with many of the same protections as wilderness land or wild and scenic rivers. However, a Wilderness Designation or Wild and Scenic Rivers Designation is incompatible with the intent of the military land withdrawals and the military training mission.

As noted earlier, where withdrawal legislation specifies joint management, collaboration between BLM and DOD is essential. Stewardship, however, is an inherent responsibility of anyone who has activities on the land regardless of legislated land management responsibilities. Stewardship implies acting responsibly in the public interest in the use and, as appropriate, restoration, improvement, preservation, and protection of federal lands and their associated resources. Good stewardship is a

fundamental policy of all land management agencies and a mandate for all users of the land.

1.6 Responsibilities

USARAK has primary responsibility for military uses of the withdrawn lands in Alaska. Under the Sikes Act, USARAK is responsible for preparing, updating, and implementing this INRMP. Since all uses and projects described in this plan support the overall military mission, implementation of this plan is defined as a military use. BLM retains stewardship responsibilities and is responsible for all nonmilitary uses. BLM is the interface with the public for all requests for resources on withdrawn lands and, through the AFS, is responsible for fire suppression on USARAK lands. USFWS and ADF&G are responsible for the management of fish and wildlife populations on all USARAK lands.

The specific items of cooperation (Appendix A) between USARAK, USFWS, ADF&G and BLM details responsibilities and facilitates management of lands withdrawn for Fort Wainwright. These items of specific cooperation includes the following stipulations:

- All agencies will implement the *Fort Wainwright Resources Management Plan* and the INRMP.
- USARAK and BLM will coordinate with each other on military and nonmilitary activities on Fort Wainwright, with the Army responsible for NEPA documentation for military activities and the BLM responsible for NEPA documentation for nonmilitary activities.
- USARAK and BLM have responsibilities for controlling public access; USARAK will coordinate with BLM to enforce public access restrictions.
- Studies conducted on Fort Wainwright by agencies other than USARAK will be coordinated with BLM.
- Fire management will be conducted in accordance with the *Fort Wainwright Resources Management Plan* and the *Interagency Fire Management Plan*.

Within DOD, many individuals and organizations listed below have responsibilities for the overall implementation of this INRMP. Responsibilities for each program are listed in greater detail in chapters 3-7. The Commanding General, USARAK, is directly responsible for operation and maintenance of Fort Wainwright, including implementation and enforcement of this INRMP. He is personally liable for compliance with laws pertaining to implementation of this plan. The USARAK Conservation Branch, DPW, Fort Wainwright, is the office through which the Commanding General, USARAK, manages natural resources at Fort Wainwright. The Conservation Branch is the primary organization directly responsible for implementing this INRMP.

The USARAK Directorate of Plans, Training, Security, and Mobilization (DPTSM) is the organization through which the Commanding General, USARAK, manages ranges at Fort Wainwright. DPTSM has responsibility for managing range complexes; coordinating military training; and releasing training areas for forestry, land rehabilitation, and recreational use. The Directorate of Personnel and Community Activities (DPCA) promotes organization and development of recreational opportunities and facilities. DPCA manages most outdoor recreation with the exception of hunting, fishing, and trapping. The Provost Marshal Office (PMO) is responsible for law enforcement on Fort Wainwright. Implementation of this plan also requires the assistance of other USARAK directorates and organizations, including Directorate of Logistics (supply and transportation), Directorate of Resource Management (budget, personnel, and equipment authorizations), Directorate of Contracting (purchasing), Public Affairs (public awareness programs), and Staff Judge Advocate (legal assistance).

USARAK's higher headquarters, USARPAC headquarters, located at Fort Shafter, Hawaii, will assist USARAK with development and implementation of conservation programs. USARPAC has review and approval authority for this INRMP and provides funding for implementation. The United States Army Environmental Center (USAEC), located at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, provides oversight, centralized management, and

execution of Army environmental programs and projects. It provides support capabilities for NEPA, endangered species, cultural resources, ITAM, environmental compliance, and related areas. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Alaska District, assists Fort Wainwright by administering contracts for outside or other agency support. It also is responsible for issuing wetlands permits in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Waterways Experiment Station (WES) assists USARAK with wetlands management. The Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory (CRREL) supports northern military installations and has an interest in natural resources management on Fort Wainwright.

1.7 Partnerships

Partnership is defined as a process by which two or more organizations with shared interests act as a team to achieve mutually beneficial goals. USARAK undertakes management of its lands with a number of federal, state, local, and public partners. Land management issues do not stop at property boundaries, but instead have an ecosystem or watershed dimension. All agencies are tied by policy to an ecosystem management approach to land management. Cooperative relations among the military services and other land management agencies foster regional approaches to dealing with stewardship issues that provide benefits beyond what could be achieved by each agency separately.

1.7.1 Federal Agencies

1.7.1.1 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

In accordance with the Sikes Act, the USFWS is a signatory and cooperator in implementation of this plan. *The Cooperative Agreement for Management of Fish and Wildlife Resources on Army Installations in Alaska* (U.S. Army 1986) directs the USFWS, the Army, and ADF&G in the management of fish and wildlife on the installation. This INRMP supersedes that agreement.

USFWS is interested in the cumulative effects of forest cutting on wildlife, especially in riparian areas, erosion on wetlands, environmental contamination, nonpoint discharge permits, habitat conservation in general, and neotropical migratory birds.

The USFWS is available for reimbursable work on Fort Wainwright, especially involving migratory birds, wetlands, and fisheries.

Appendix A includes specific items of cooperation between the USFWS, BLM, ADF&G, and USARAK as required by the Sikes Act.

1.7.1.2 U.S. Bureau of Land Management

BLM is a signatory and cooperator in implementation of this INRMP. BLM retains jurisdiction of timber and mineral rights on PL106-65 withdrawn lands, with the Army having right of non-concurrence. The Defense Appropriations Act of 2000 (PL106-65) stipulates that BLM is responsible for developing an RMP for military withdrawals in Alaska. An RMP and associated Final Environmental Impact Statement were developed in accordance with the previous act (PL 99-606) (BLM and U.S. Army 1994). Many items within the RMP are included within this INRMP. Appendix A includes specific items of cooperation between the BLM, USFWS, ADF&G, and Fort Wainwright.

The AFS provides fire suppression, prescribed burning, and fire planning support to Fort Wainwright. BLM also has a strong interest in the protection of cultural resources on withdrawn lands.

1.7.1.3 U.S. Forest Service

The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) provides technical assistance for forest management on Fort Wainwright. The USFS has particular interest in forest pests and forest inventory. Several USFS inventory plots are located on Fort Wainwright. The Institute of Northern Forestry, a research arm of the USFS, was located in Fairbanks until it closed in 1996. Fort Wainwright has no lands owned or controlled by the USFS.

1.7.1.4 Natural Resources Conservation Service

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) cooperates in land management and soil conservation on Fort Wainwright. NRCS has a special interest in the development of Fort Wainwright's ITAM program due to its assessment and treatment of soil erosion. The NRCS is available for limited, reimbursable engineering support for

the LRAM program. Currently, NRCS is conducting a soil survey of Fort Wainwright.

1.7.1.5 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 10, is involved in numerous environmental compliance, restoration, and pollution prevention actions at Fort Wainwright. Currently, cooperation between the Conservation Branch and the EPA is not required.

1.7.1.6 Office of Aircraft Services

The OAS provides reimbursable contract aircraft and services for implementation of this INRMP. The OAS has been used for natural resources management on Fort Wainwright in the past and will continue to be used during the 2002-2006 period.

1.7.2 State Agencies

1.7.2.1 Alaska Department of Fish and Game

ADF&G manages wildlife populations on Fort Wainwright. The installation overlaps parts of ADF&G's Fairbanks and Delta Junction fish management areas, and it encompasses parts of Game Management Units 20A and 20B. The regional ADF&G office is in Fairbanks.

ADF&G stocks fish in five lakes on Fort Wainwright and monitors angler use. ADF&G monitors moose and assists with habitat improvement on Fort Wainwright. ADF&G is conducting research on the effects of large-scale logging on game and nongame species and is interested in plans for timber harvesting on Fort Wainwright.

ADF&G assists in fish and wildlife management on Fort Wainwright in accordance with a *Cooperative Agreement for Management of Fish and Wildlife Resources on Army Installations in Alaska* (U.S. Army 1986). This INRMP supersedes that agreement. As required by the Sikes Act, ADF&G is a signatory and cooperating agency in the implementation of this plan. Appendix A includes specific items of cooperation between the ADF&G, BLM, USFWS, and Fort Wainwright, as required by the Sikes Act.

1.7.2.2 Alaska Department of Natural Resources

1.7.2.2.1 Division of Forestry

The Alaska Department of Natural Resources (ADNR), Division of Forestry, is a cooperating agency for forest management on Fort Wainwright. ADNR's specific concerns include prescribed burns and fire suppression; forest pest management; and forest inventory, harvesting, and regeneration.

1.7.2.2.2 Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation

The ADNR Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation manages the 254,080-acre Chena River State Recreation Area, which borders YTA to the north. Approximately 13,000 acres of land within YTA were designated as part of the Chena River State Recreation Area by the Alaska state legislature. This state action neither transferred title of the land nor was it supported by federal agencies. No active cooperation occurs between USARAK and ADNR Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation.

1.7.2.2.3 Plant Materials Center

USARAK has entered into a cooperative agreement with ADNR Plant Materials Center (PMC) for enhancing, rehabilitating, and maintaining USARAK training lands to ensure their continued long-term use and effectiveness. The center will partner with USARAK to conduct revegetation projects and provide plant materials advice.

1.7.2.3 Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) is responsible for air and water quality in Alaska. Air quality permits are required for prescribed burning on Fort Wainwright. The relationship between ADEC and Fort Wainwright is primarily regulatory.

1.7.2.4 Palmer Soil and Water Conservation District

USARAK entered into a cooperative agreement with the Palmer Soil and Water Conservation District (PSWCD) in 1998 for enhancing, rehabilitating, and maintaining USARAK training lands to ensure their continued long-term use and effec-

tiveness. The district historically partnered with USARAK to conduct LRAM, erosion control, and habitat management projects and will continue to back up the PSWCD for these types of projects if needed.

1.7.2.5 Universities

Universities provide specialized expertise to assist in effectively managing natural resources on Fort Wainwright. The University of Alaska, Fairbanks (UAF), is the installation's nearest resource for academic research. UAF conducts research on Willow Island, located within TFTA, as part of the National Science Foundation's Long-Term Ecological Research Program. The Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands (CEMML) at Colorado State University (CSU) supports ITAM, GIS, NEPA, and general natural resources inventory and management programs on Fort Wainwright.

1.7.3 Fairbanks North Star Borough

Primary interests of the Fairbanks North Star Borough with regard to the military include:

- Supporting the military's presence in the borough as an important part of the community.
- Facilitating the integration of the military population with that of the borough as a whole.
- Encouraging cooperative military / community solutions to issues of concern to both parties.
- Assuming planning responsibility for all land to be surplus by the military.

Specific natural resources management concerns regarding Fort Wainwright were not expressed by the borough (FNSB Community Planning 1999).

1.7.4 Tanana Chiefs Conference

The Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. (TCC), also known as Dena' Nena' Henash, with offices in Fairbanks, Tok, and elsewhere in interior Alaska, is a tribal consortium of 42 member tribes and Alaska Native organizations, 37 of which are federally recognized tribal governments. The TCC region approximates the size of Texas at 235,000 square miles, or a third of Alaska. TCC is the largest non-profit tribal consortium in Alaska and

contracts a wide variety of services from federal, state, and private sectors. TCC operates more than 200 service programs to benefit more than 17,000 Athabascan and other Alaska Natives and stateside Native Americans living in interior Alaska. These services include reality functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs on more than 260,000 acres of restricted status lands (Native allotments and restricted townsites) pursuant to PL 93-638, as well as a technical assistance and facilitation program for federally recognized tribal governments in dealing with military-related government-to-government consultation and environmental restoration activities. This program may facilitate consultation between the Army and federally recognized tribes in interior Alaska if requested to do so by the tribal government.

1.7.5 Other Partners

Both local and private partners are involved in the management of USARAK lands.

The Nature Conservancy, a private organization, also is a partner for the conservation of land.

The public is an important partner in the preparation of this plan. A public Restoration Advisory Board meeting was held on January 23, 2001, to explain the INRMP planning process and invite public comment. A notice of intent to update the INRMP was published in the both The Fairbanks Daily News Miner and The Delta Wind. This notice invited the public to provide its comments and concerns in the form of a survey, available by mail or on the USARAK natural resources web site. The public was also invited to review the draft INRMP and the FNSI, as a part of the public review period for the INRMP and Environmental Assessment (EA).

1.8 National Environmental Policy Act Compliance and Integration

In addition to guiding the natural resources management program at Fort Wainwright from 2002-2006, this plan also contains the associated documentation required for compliance with NEPA. NEPA requires federal agencies to consider

environmental consequences of major proposed actions. NEPA documentation for this INRMP is in the form of an EA, which analyzes the potential consequences of the proposed action to implement the Fort Wainwright plan.

1.8.1 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

NEPA requires federal agencies to consider the environmental consequences of proposed major federal actions. The premise of NEPA is to provide environmental information to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and actions are taken. The process is intended to help public officials and citizens make decisions that are based on timely and scientifically accurate information. The analysis must fully disclose the environmental effects of the action and demonstrate that the project proponent and the decision-maker have taken an interdisciplinary “hard look” at the environmental consequences of implementing the major federal action. Ultimately, federal agencies must consider all practicable means to restore and enhance the quality of the human environment and avoid or minimize any possible adverse effects of their actions upon the quality of the human environment.

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) was established under NEPA to implement and oversee federal policy in this decision-making process. The CEQ uses the *Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act* (40 CFR 1500-1508) for this function. CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1508.9) specify that an EA be prepared to:

- Briefly provide evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI).
- Aid in an agency’s compliance with NEPA when no EIS is necessary.
- Facilitate preparation of an EIS when one is necessary.

In addition, according to CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1500.2(c)), NEPA’s requirements should be integrated “with other planning and environmental review procedures required by law or by agency

practice so that all such procedures run concurrently rather than consecutively.”

1.8.2 Army Regulations 200-2 and 200-3

AR 200-2, *Environmental Effects of Army Actions*, dictates policies, responsibilities, and procedures for integrating environmental considerations into Army planning and decision-making. It implements the CEQ’s NEPA regulations and directs installations to integrate environmental analysis as much as practicable with other environmental reviews, laws, directives, and executive orders. This regulation requires that natural resources management plans be evaluated for environmental impacts (AR 200-2 Chapter 5, Section 5-3(k)). The requirements of AR 200-2 will be addressed through the preparation of an EA on the potential effects of implementing an INRMP on USARAK lands.

AR 200-3, *Natural Resources-Land, Forest and Wildlife Management*, outlines policy, procedures, and responsibilities for the conservation, management, and restoration of land and the natural resources thereon consistent with the military mission and other applicable national policies. AR 200-3 states that “INRMPs require appropriate environmental review according to the NEPA and AR 200-2...appropriate level of documentation will be determined on an installation by installation basis.” AR 200-3 further states, “It is Army policy to integrate environmental reviews concurrently with other Army planning and decision-making actions to avoid delays in mission accomplishments.”

1.8.3 INRMP and NEPA Integration

AR 200-2 (Chapter 2, Section 2-6(e)) states that “Environmental analysis and documentation required by this regulation will be integrated as much as practicable with other environmental reviews (40 CFR 1502.25).” Section 2-6(e)(5) identifies the following category components, “Installation management plans, particularly those that deal directly with the environment. These include the Natural Resources Management Plans (Fish and Wildlife Management Plan, Forest Management Plan, and Range Improvement or Maintenance Plan).”

CEQ regulations suggest NEPA documents be combined with other agency documents to reduce duplication and paperwork (40 CFR 1506.4) so that agencies can focus on the real purpose of the NEPA analysis, which is making better decisions. In an effort to follow Army guidelines recommending concurrent preparation of the INRMP and its associated NEPA analysis, USARAK has prepared a single document. The resulting “planning assessment” includes a comprehensive description, analysis, and evaluation of all environmental components at Fort Wainwright. Additionally, it formalizes existing natural resources practices and can be used as an effective tool for future planning and decision-making.

As proposed projects within this INRMP are implemented, appropriate required NEPA documentation will be prepared. Projects will be evaluated to determine the need for and appropriate level of NEPA documentation, such as a Record of Environmental Consideration (REC), EA with a FNSI, or an EIS with a Record of Decision (ROD).

In order to easily locate required NEPA elements woven throughout the INRMP, the following table lists their corresponding locations within the document. The remaining sections relate specifically to the INRMP.

Table 1-1. Location of NEPA Analysis Sections within the INRMP.

<i>EA Requirements</i>	<i>Sections within the INRMP</i>
Purpose of and Need for Action	Section 1.8.4
Alternatives Including the Proposed Action	Chapter 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7
Affected Environment	Chapter 9
List of Agencies and Persons Consulted	Consultation section
Conclusion on Whether Environmental Impacts are Significant	Section 9.4
References	Reference section
List of Preparers	Preparers section

1.8.4 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

USARAK proposes to implement an INRMP at Fort Wainwright to support the management of natural resources using the methods described within the plan itself. The purposes of the plan are to support the military mission, to provide for USARAK’s continuing need to train in a realistic environment, to maintain local community needs, and to comply with other laws and regulations, including the Sikes Act Improvement Amendments. This plan is needed to establish a natural resources management philosophy to guide decision-making actions over the next five years at Fort Wainwright.

1.8.5 Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives

1.8.5.1 Proposed Management / Proposed Action Alternative

The proposed action is to fully implement the INRMP for Fort Wainwright, Alaska, over the 2002-2006 planning period. Implementation of this proposal would meet the Army’s need to fulfill natural resources management goals, objectives, and policy on military lands in Alaska and to guide natural resources managers in decision-making regarding management of military land and proposed management projects concurrent with the military mission. The development of selected management measures for the INRMP involved a screening analysis of resource-specific alternatives during the development of individual resource management plans. The screening process involved the use of accepted criteria, standards, and guidelines, when available, and best professional judgment to identify management practices for achieving Fort Wainwright natural resources objectives. The proposed action involves the implementation of the management objectives listed in Chapters 3-7 for each resource at Fort Wainwright. The five-year planning period (2002-2006) allows for natural resources to be adaptively managed over time. Thus, projects and management schemes are structured to support this time frame. Additional environmen-

tal analysis may be required with the development of new management schemes.

1.8.5.2 Current Management / No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, the management objectives presented in this INRMP would not be implemented. Current management objectives would remain in effect and are described for each resource in Chapters 3-7. The existing condition of the human environment at Fort Wainwright would continue as the status quo under the no action alternative. This state is defined as those conditions described in Chapter 2, Affected Environment, without implementation of the proposed management objectives listed in Chapters 3-7. Development and consideration of a no action alternative is required by CEQ regulation (40 CFR 1502.14(d)) and serves as a benchmark against which proposed federal actions can be evaluated.

This current 2002-2006 INRMP is an update of the 1998-2002 Fort Wainwright INRMP. Many of the proposed projects in the 1998-2002 plan were funded and implemented on Fort Wainwright. However, some projects were not completed. Funds have been obligated towards completion of the following projects and are considered part of the current management:

- Staff salaries, equipment, and supplies
- Cultural resources studies
- LCTA program
- Forest management plan and commercial feasibility study
- Range improvement activities
- Supply Creamer's Field with bird feed
- Conduct moose census
- Develop Cross Cultural Communication Steering Committee
- Develop hunting, trapping, and fishing computerized check-in system
- Conduct hazard fuels reduction project at Badger Gate and Hamilton Acres in conjunction with BLM AFS

- Purchase portable fuel tank for refueling OAS aircraft
- Rehabilitate Trench Line Objective and Russian Trench
- Resurface Manchu Lake Road
- Harden access to Horseshoe Lake
- Increase accessibility and fishing opportunities at River Road Pond

1.8.5.3 Other Alternatives Considered and Eliminated

Additional alternatives considered for the management of Fort Wainwright's natural resources are described and evaluated within the sections of Chapters 3-7 that discuss the management of each resource. During the development of these various management alternatives, it was determined that an infinite number of management schemes are possible. Consistent with the intent of NEPA, this process focused on considering a reasonable range of resource-specific management alternatives and, from those, developing a plan that could be implemented, as a whole, in the foreseeable future. Management alternatives that were considered during the above-mentioned screening process, but not analyzed in detail, are discussed within Chapters 3-7 along with the rationale for their non-selection. Application of this screening process in developing the proposed action (implementation of the management options listed in Chapters 3-7 of this INRMP) eliminated the need to define and evaluate hypothetical alternatives to plan implementation. As a result, the EA (which is an integral part of this document) formally addresses only two alternatives: the proposed management actions and the no action alternative (current management).

1.8.6 Scope of Analysis

The potential environmental effects associated with the proposed action are assessed in compliance with NEPA, CEQ regulations and AR 200-2. The EA component of this INRMP identifies, documents, and evaluates the effects of implementing the document at Fort Wainwright. The INRMP addresses the geographical area associated with the contiguous properties of Fort Wainwright, Alaska. As discussed, the EA component examines the

Army's proposed action (i.e., as described in Section 1.8.5.1 and the objectives listed in Chapters 3-7) and a no action alternative (i.e., as described in Section 1.8.5.2) and their potential environmental effects. In addition, the existing environment was identified and used as a measure against which to analyze the proposed action. Thus, the potential beneficial and adverse effects associated with the proposal were determined and listed in Chapter 9.

While many aspects of the military mission are discussed in this INRMP, only the impacts of the natural resources alternatives are considered. The impacts of the continued withdrawal for military use of YTA of Fort Wainwright were considered in the *Alaska Army Lands Withdrawal Renewal Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement*. Impacts of ongoing and future training activities would be considered in a separate NEPA document.

1.8.7 Interagency Coordination and Review

Interagency participation is invited throughout the process for developing the INRMP. Once the INRMP has been drafted, the EA may be used as a tool to inform decision-makers and the public of the likely environmental consequences of implementing the proposed action and alternatives. In addition, USARAK provides for public participation in the NEPA process to promote open communication and better decision-making. Public participation is invited throughout the NEPA process for developing the EA portion of the document. The following discussion describes agency and public involvement for this project.

Interagency Coordination. On December 28, 2000, a formal agency consultation letter was mailed to the state and regional directors of the three agencies, declaring USARAK's intent to update the INRMPs for the 2002-2006 planning period. Meetings and document review sessions have been held between USARAK and the partner-agencies.

On February 21 and 22, 2001, an agency introduction meeting was held at Fort Richardson in Anchorage, Alaska, and at Fort Wainwright in Fairbanks, Alaska. The purpose of the meeting was to enable

representatives from BLM, USFWS, ADF&G, and USARAK to establish formal communications and address any concerns regarding the preparation of the INRMP and EA. Attendees discussed the INRMP review and meeting schedule, agency coordination, the approach for conducting the INRMP and NEPA analysis, and objectives and scope of the INRMP and NEPA analysis.

Project Review and Comment. The primary responsible agencies were provided an opportunity to review and comment on three separate drafts of the INRMP as listed below (Table 1-2).

Comments were incorporated into the document and the final draft was distributed to these agencies for final signatory approval on September 5-6, 2001. A Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) was prepared for the final version of the INRMP/EA.

Public Participation. The public and concerned organizations were notified of USARAK's intent to update the existing INRMPs for the 2002-2006 planning period. Requests for public input to assist the Army in determining local relevant issues were published in the Fairbanks Daily News Miner, the Anchorage Daily News, and the Delta Junction Delta Wind. Individuals were asked to fill out a Public Issues Questionnaire, which was used to gather information regarding natural resources and land use issues and concerns. Two editions of an environmental resources newsletter were published and distributed to interested parties, including those on the USARAK mailing list and to individuals registering for a USARAK hunting, trapping, and fishing permit. The USARAK conservation web site (<http://www.usarak.army.mil/conservation>) was also utilized as a public participation interface. The web site offered the public and concerned organizations the ability to review the Draft INRMP, submit comments, request additional information, and obtain additional copies of the newsletters. In addition, presentations were given at the Fairbanks, Anchorage, and Delta Junction Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meetings requesting public participation.

An FNSI and the INRMP/EA was available for public review for 30 days before USARAK initiated the proposed action.

Table 1-2. INRMP Review Schedule.

<i>Meetings</i>	<i>Meeting Function</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>
Agency Introduction Meeting	Distribute First Draft	February 21, 2001	Anchorage
		February 22, 2001	Fairbanks
Agency Comment Meeting	First Draft Comments Due	March 28, 2001	Anchorage
		March 29, 2001	Fairbanks
Agency Update Meeting	Distribute Second Draft	April 25, 2001	Anchorage
		April 26, 2001	Fairbanks
Agency Comment Meeting	Second Draft Comments Due	May 23, 2001	Anchorage
		May 24, 2001	Fairbanks
Agency Update Meeting	Distribute Final Draft	June 27, 2001	Anchorage
		June 28, 2001	Fairbanks
30-day Public Review Begins	Distribute for Public Review	June 20, 2001	Local newspapers, libraries, web site
Agency Update Meeting	Discuss Public Comments	July 2, 2001	Anchorage
		July 26, 2001	Fairbanks
30-day Public Review Ends	Collect Public Comments	August 1, 2001	Local newspapers, libraries, web site
Final Agency Meeting	Final Draft Comments Due	August 15, 2001	Anchorage
		August 16, 2001	Fairbanks
Final Plans Distributed to Agencies for Signature Approval		September 5, 2001	Anchorage
		September 6, 2001	Fairbanks
Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) Prepared and Published		September 6, 2001	
Original Signature Pages Due		September 26, 2001	